

--- On Wed, 4/13/11, Alison Nguyen <a\_l\_p\_h\_a\_construction@hotmail.com> wrote:  
 From: Alison Nguyen <a\_l\_p\_h\_a\_construction@hotmail.com>  
 Subject: 1970 Maple Ave, Costa Mesa, CA--PA-10-38  
 To: rdickson.cmpc@gmail.com, colinkmccarthy@yahoo.com, esalcedo100@gmail.com  
 Date: Wednesday, April 13, 2011, 12:30 AM  
 Attn. to Commissioners,

Thank you for being supportive and provide positive feedback at the Planning Commission Review meeting on April 11. I would like to provide some clarification on No. 3 in the staff's Conditions of Approval and request for a removal of this item.

Item No. 3 asks the Owner to provide a 10' setback for the second floor level on the South side of the property. In doing so, it will bring the project to a complete 100% compliant and will automatically remove this issue "... a two-unit, two story detached residential common interest development (condominiums) that does not comply with the recommended residential design guidelines with respect to second to first floor ratio and second floor side setbacks and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor building massing."

Everybody at the meeting is well informed with this noncompliant issue stated above. During the final commentary, Mr. Vice Chairman, Sam Clark, was not supporting and would not vote yes for this project because of the second to first floor ratio being 98%. Mr. Chairman, Colin McCarthy was supporting this project knowing that if taken the double ceiling air space out from the floor ratio calculation, the ratio will be less than 98% (which is 55%, please see the attached floor plan). The massing of the buildings is not an issue since the units are detached. The 3 votes "yes" without removing item No. 3 from the Conditional Approval that I have received on April 11, 2010 means "no" that is the tricky part of its existence. No. 3 means I agree with Mr. Sam Clark.

I have been working with the city planning staffs in previous months and brought the project to compliant with all issues except this one. That is why it remains in the staff's report. This is the last item in the check list that can kill the project.

Also, please note that due to the lot width being 55', it is very undesirable for developer to work with. This might be the caught for this site never get develops. Increase the second floor set back from 5' to 10' will greatly diminish the layout of the floor plan and make it less desirable. In addition, bearing or strong walls are usually locate on the side yard direction, reset the second floor in (any 1', 2', ... 5') will require using large beam underneath for support, which will cost more and lower the ceiling space on 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The project is expensive; it does not need to get more expensive unnecessary to provide visual relief on the side yard, a part of the property where it does not get use or look at often on the neighbor side.

In the past 4 years, 3 different owners and developers have tried to work with this property. They never finish! I think the current Owner would be the last brave one that is willing to fund this project. In this recess market, investors don't want to build. The area is a slump. The city will not be able to find homeowner or investors to build in this neighborhood for years until the economy market gets better.

Please think of all the benefit it will bring to the neighborhood, the community at large, and weight this issue. I want this project; the neighbors want this project. If you have voted yes and want this project to get build, Item No. 3 on the Conditional Approval must be removed.

Thank you for taking the time to look into this issue. I'm looking forward to hearing from you.

P.S. There is a flaw in the residential guide line. Floor ratio is the calculation of the floor areas not the air spaces. Can you walk on air?  
 Regards,  
 Alison Nguyen  
 Alpha Construction  
 (714) 470-0684  
 14561 Golders Green Lane  
 Westminster, CA 92683